



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/289,513	04/09/1999	PHILIP R. WISER	P-2090	8705

24214 7590 06/17/2002

JAMES D IVEY  
3025 TOTTERDELL STREET  
OAKLAND, CA 94611-1742

EXAMINER

GILLIGAN, CHRISTOPHER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/289,513

Applicant(s)

WISER ET AL.

Examiner

Luke Gilligan

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

***Response to Amendment***

1. In the amendment filed 4/1/02 in paper number 11, the following has occurred: Claims 1 and 39 have been amended and Claim 50 has been canceled without traverse. Now, Claims 1-49 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 6 recites the limitation "data held secret by the media licensing computer system". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because there is no mention of a media licensing computer system in any of the claims which claim 6 depends upon. Claims 7 and 8 are dependent on claim 6.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 3626

6. Claims 1-3, 10-26, and 39-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Payne et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314.

7. As per claim 1, Payne et al. teach a method for conducting electronic commerce through a computer network, the method comprising: receiving, in a merchant computer system of the computer network, a purchase request for a digital product (see column 5, lines 26-29, payment computer of Payne et al. is read upon by the merchant system); receiving payment data in the merchant computer system wherein the payment data specifies remuneration for the digital product (see column 5, lines 29-34, this step is preformed by the payment computer of Payne et al.); sending a request for reservation of the digital product to a content manager computer system which can be different from the merchant computer system and which is coupled to the merchant computer system through the computer network (see column 7, lines 31-33, merchant computer of Payne et al. is read upon by the content manager, the request includes a request to reserve access to the digital document for a specified duration of time; the two computers are coupled via network 10 of Payne et al, see figure 1); receiving, in the content manager computer system a delivery request signal from the merchant computer system wherein the delivery request signal requests delivery of the digital product to a client computer system through the computer network (see column 7, lines 31-39, the delivery request is sent from the payment computer to the merchant computer via the buyer computer); sending transaction identification data to the client computer system wherein the transaction identification data identifies the digital product and represents remuneration in accordance with the payment data (see column 7, lines 18-24 and lines 31-32); receiving, in a delivery computer system of the computer network, the transaction identification data from the client computer system (see column 7, lines 32-33); determining within the delivery computer system, in accordance with the transaction

Art Unit: 3626

identification data, the digital product (see column 7, lines 27-33); and sending, from the delivery computer system, the digital product to the client computer system (see column 7, lines 46-50).

8. As per claim 2, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 1 as described above, further comprising: sending, from the delivery computer system to the content manager computer system, a signal indicating that sending the digital product to the client computer system is completed (see column 3, lines 24-27).

9. As per claim 3, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 2 as described above, further comprising: recording, by the content manager computer system, purchase data identifying the digital product and indicating that the digital product was purchased (see column 3, lines 24-27).

10. As per claim 10, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 1 as described above, wherein requesting reservation by the merchant computer system comprises: encrypting data representing a requested reservation (see column 1, lines 59-64); sending the data as encrypted to the content manager computer system (see column 1, line 64 – column 2, line 2); and decrypting the data within the content manager computer system (see column 1, line 64 – column 2, line 2, the data has to be decrypted to be viewed).

11. As per claim 11, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 1 as described above, wherein, in response to requesting reservation by the merchant computer system, the content manager computer system effects such a reservation of the digital product by: forming transaction data which include (i) the transaction identification data, (ii) product identification data which identifies the digital product, and (iii) binding data which binds the transaction to the client computer system (see column 5, lines 30-44); and sending the transaction data to the merchant computer system (see column 5, lines 48-53).

Art Unit: 3626

12. As per claim 12, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 11 as described above, wherein sending the transaction identification data comprises encrypting the transaction identification data (see column 5, lines 42-47).

13. As per claim 13, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 1 as described above, further comprising: sending, from the merchant computer system, the payment data to a payment authority (see column 1, lines 55-59); and receiving, in the merchant computer system from the payment authority, payment authorization data (see column 1, lines 59-64).

14. As per claim 14, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 13 as described above, further comprising: sending the payment authorization data to the content manager computer system (see column 2, lines 11-18).

15. As per claim 15, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 14 as described above, wherein sending the payment authorization data comprises: encrypting the payment authorization data (see column 1, line 64 – column, line 2).

16. As per claim 16, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 14 as described above, further comprising recording, by the content manager computer system, that payment for the digital product has been authorized (see column 2, lines 3-11).

17. As per claim 17, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 16 as described above, further comprising: receiving, in the merchant computer system from the content manager computer system, acknowledgment data which indicates that payment for the digital product has been recorded (see column 2, lines 11-18).

18. As per claim 18, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 17 as described above, wherein acknowledgement data includes the transaction identification data and a payment authorization token which identifies payment authorization as recorded by the content manager computer system (see column 2, lines 11-18).

Art Unit: 3626

19. As per claim 19, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 18 as described above, wherein the delivery request signal includes the transaction identification data and the delivery authorization token (see column 6, lines 30-41).

20. As per claim 20, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 19 as described above, wherein the delivery request signal is generated in response to selection of a URL by the user wherein the URL specifies the transaction identification data and the delivery authorization token (see column 6, lines 31-35).

21. As per claim 21, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 17 as described above, wherein the acknowledgement data is encrypted (see column 1, line 64 – column 2, line 2).

22. As per claim 22, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 1 as described above, wherein the delivery request signal is received in the content manager computer system from the client computer system (see column 4, lines 60-63); and further wherein the delivery request signal is generated by the client computer system in response to user-generated control signals (see column 4, lines 35-37).

23. As per claim 23, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 22 as described above, wherein the user-generated control signals are incident to a graphical user interface of a web browser (see column 4, lines 43-45 and figure 5); and further wherein the user-generated control signals cause the client computer system to send the delivery request signal to the merchant computer system which in turn communicates the delivery request signal to the content manager computer system (see column 4, lines 60-63).

24. As per claim 24, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 1 as described above, wherein the delivery request signal includes the transaction identification data (see column 5, lines 27-44).

Art Unit: 3626

25. As per claim 25, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 24 as described above, wherein the delivery request signal is generated in response to selection of a URL by the user wherein the URL specifies the transaction identification data (see column 5, lines 27-30).

26. As per claim 26, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 1 as described above, wherein the transaction identification data, as received by the delivery computer system is certified as originating from the client computer system (see column 5, line 42, particularly the "buyer network address").

27. As per claim 39, Payne et al. teach a method for conducting electronic commerce through a computer network, the method comprising: receiving, in a merchant computer system of the computer network, a purchase request for a digital product (see column 5, lines 26-29, payment computer of Payne et al. is read upon by the merchant system); receiving payment data in the merchant computer system wherein the payment data specifies remuneration for the digital product (see column 5, lines 29-34, this step is preformed by the payment computer of Payne et al.); sending a request for reservation of the digital product to a content manager computer system which can be different from the merchant computer system and which is coupled to the merchant computer system through the computer network (see column 7, lines 31-33, merchant computer of Payne et al. is read upon by the content manager, the request includes a request to reserve access to the digital document for a specified duration of time; the two computers are coupled via network 10 of Payne et al, see figure 1); receiving, from the content manager computer system, voucher data which is readable by the content manager computer system and which represents to the content manager computer system a transaction in which the remuneration specified by the payment data is exchanged for the digital product (see column 5, lines 48-56).



Art Unit: 3626

28. As per claim 40, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 39 as described above, further comprising: receiving, from the content manager computer system, inventory data which specifies available digital products, including the digital product, and specified remuneration to the content manager computer system for each of the available digital products (see column 4, lines 46-49).

29. As per claim 41, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 40 as described above, wherein requesting reservation comprises: encrypting data representing a requested reservation (see column 1, lines 59-64); sending the data as encrypted to the content manager computer system (see column 1, line 64 – column 2, line 2); and decrypting the data within the content manager computer system (see column 1, line 64 – column 2, line 2, the data has to be decrypted to be viewed).

30. As per claim 42, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 40 as described above, further comprising: sending, from the merchant computer system, the payment data to a payment authority (see column 1, lines 55-59); and receiving, in the merchant computer system from the payment authority, payment authorization data (see column 1, lines 59-64).

31. As per claim 43, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 42 as described above, further comprising: sending the payment authorization data to the content manager computer system (see column 2, lines 11-18).

32. As per claim 44, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 43 as described above, wherein sending the payment authorization data comprises: encrypting the payment authorization data (see column 1, line 64 – column, line 2).

33. As per claim 45, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 44 as described above, further comprising: receiving, in the merchant computer system from the content manager computer

Art Unit: 3626

system, acknowledgment data which indicates that payment for the digital product has been recorded (see column 2, lines 11-18).

34. As per claim 46, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 45 as described above, wherein acknowledgement data includes the transaction identification data and a payment authorization token which identifies payment authorization as recorded by the content manager computer system (see column 2, lines 11-18).

35. As per claim 47, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 46 as described above, wherein the delivery request signal includes the transaction identification data and the delivery authorization token (see column 6, lines 30-41).

36. As per claim 48, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 47 as described above, wherein the delivery request signal is generated in response to selection of a URL by the user wherein the URL specifies the transaction identification data and the delivery authorization token (see column 6, lines 31-35).

37. As per claim 49, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 45 as described above, wherein the acknowledgement data is encrypted (see column 1, line 64 – column 2, line 2).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

38. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

39. Claims 4, 5, 9, and 27-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,5715,314 in view of Stefik et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,236,971.

Art Unit: 3626

40. As per claim 4, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 3 as described above. Payne et al. do not explicitly teach apportioning compensation for sales of the digital product through a media licensing computer system. Stefik et al. teach apportioning compensation for sales of the digital product through a media licensing computer system (see column 4, lines 40-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the licensing capabilities of Stefik et al. with the electronic commerce environment of Payne et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include this element for the purpose of provide a more diverse purchasing option to a prospective buyer.

41. As per claim 5, Payne et al. in view of Stefik et al. teach the method of claim 4 as described above, further comprising: aggregating purchase data from the content manager computer system and other purchase data from one or more other content manager computer system to form aggregated purchase data (see column 7, lines 55-59); and sending the aggregated purchase data to a rights agent computer system such that the rights agent computer system can apportion compensation for sales of the digital product (see column 7, lines 59-65).

42. As per claim 9, Payne et al. teach the method of claim 1 as described above. Payne et al. do not explicitly teach encrypting the digital product before sending it to the client computer system and then decrypting it once in the client computer system. Stefik et al. teach encrypting the digital product before sending it to the client computer system and then decrypting it once in the client computer system (see column 26, lines 39-52). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the encrypting element of Stefik et al. with the electronic commerce method of Payne et al. for the purpose of providing increased security to users of the system.

Art Unit: 3626

43. Claims 27-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Payne et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314. Payne et al. teach the method of claim 26 as described above. Payne et al. do not explicitly teach the specific types of digital products in claims 27-38. However, these types of digital media were old and well known at the time the invention was made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include any of these types of digital media in the method of Payne et al. for the purpose of providing a more diverse selection to buyers.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

44. In the remarks filed 4/1/02 in paper number 11, Applicants argue in substance that (1) it is unclear which of the various computer systems of Payne et al. are read upon by the various claimed computer systems of independent claims 1 and 39; (2) Payne et al. does not teach or suggest any direct interaction between payment computer and merchant computer as recited in the receiving delivery request step of claim 1; (3) there is no teaching of the recited reservation step.

45. In response to Applicants' argument (1), further comments have been added to the rejections above to in an attempt to clear up any confusion. The rejections themselves, however, have not been changed.

46. In response to Applicants' argument (2), the Examiner acknowledges that Payne et al. teach receiving in the merchant computer (content manager of claim 1) a delivery request from the payment computer (merchant system of claim 1) by way of the buyer computer. However, in this process, it appears to the Examiner the buyer computer is merely functioning as a router to rout the access URL (delivery request signal of claim 1) from the payment computer to the merchant computer (see column 7, lines 31-33). Therefore, the merchant computer (content

Art Unit: 3626

manager of claim 1) receives an access URL (delivery request signal of claim 1) from the payment computer (merchant system of claim 1).

47. In response to Applicants' claim (3), the only recited reservation step of claim 1 is "sending a request for reservation of the digital product to a content manager computer system which can be different from the merchant computer system and which is coupled to the merchant computer system through the computer network". Payne et al. teach sending an access URL that includes a duration time to access the product (see column 7, lines 18-21). This sending of a request that includes a duration is taken by the Examiner to be a form of sending a request for reservation.

48. Finally, the Examiner reminds Applicants that since there has been no response to the rejections of claims 6-8 under 25 U.S.C. 112, either by way of amendment or arguments, the rejections stand.

### ***Conclusion***

49. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

50. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3626

51. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke Gilligan whose telephone number is (703) 308-6104. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5:30pm.


52. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on (703) 305-9588. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

53. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



CLG

June 13, 2002



JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600